



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,076	05/19/2000	David B. Kinder	INTL-0367-US(P8586)	1607
21906	7590	06/15/2005	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100 HOUSTON, TX 77024			VU, NGOC K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/575,076

Applicant(s)

KINDER ET AL.

Examiner

Ngoc K. Vu

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/31/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, applicant argues that there is no suggestion in either of the cited references (Hidary and Parasnis references) of warning a website hosting facility when a program is about to be broadcast, including a URL that points to a website hosted by that website hosting facility. This argument is not persuasive (Emphasis added).

It is noted that the feature of scheduling information about when a program (e.g., video program) will be broadcast is not claimed. Claim 1 recites limitation "sending, to a web site hosting facility, scheduling information about when a uniform resource locator will be transmitted..." The term "scheduling information" indicates when a URL will be transmitted. From this view, Hidary of the record teaches that member broadcaster 66 is provided with a GUI for pre-scheduling URL to server 90 for transmitting to user 118 at particular times of day. This feature includes "scheduling information" indicating specific times of day. Hidary also discloses that the system distributes video program, i.e., television show, with URL to user 118 (see col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 14; col. 5, lines 1-5).

Hidary does not teach sending the scheduling information to server before distributing video program and URL to user to enable the server to prepare for an increase access load, while Parasnis teaches sending scheduling information to Netshow server to handle expected load when the broadcaster desires to broadcast presentation. Particularly, Parasnis teaches that the broadcaster selects which server, e.g., Netshow or non-Netshow server, for using. The selecting feature also includes sending scheduling information to the selected server to schedule the presentation broadcast. It is noted that non-Netshow server handles maximum 15 users to access the server for watching the presentation, while Netshow server handles more

Art Unit: 2611

than 15 users. The system provides a web page that contains a URL at which the presentation broadcast will be viewed. (see col. 14, lines 43-47; col. 14, line 65 to col. 15, line 1; Figure 5 and col. 15, lines 17-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hidary by providing scheduling information to server, i.e., netshow server, before broadcast video program and URL as taught by Parasnis in order to enable the server to efficiently handling the expected load.

Thus, limitations in claim 1 are met by teaching of Hidary and Parasnis at least based on the interpretation above. Claim 21 is rejected with the similar reasons as addressed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-11, 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidary (US 5,774,664 A) in view of Parasnis et al. (U.S. 6,728,753 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Hidary discloses a method comprising sending scheduling information via user interface to server 90 for pre-scheduling URL for transmission to users 118 at particular times of day before broadcast video information (see col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 14; col. 6, lines 32-41); and transmitting the video information in the form of television programming (e.g., television show – see col. 6, lines 3-12 and figure 4).

Hidary does not teach sending the scheduling information to server before distributing video program and URL to user to enable the server to prepare for an increase access load. However, Parasnis teaches sending scheduling information to Netshow server to handle

Art Unit: 2611

expected load when the broadcaster desires to broadcast presentation. Particularly, the broadcaster selects which server, e.g., Netshow or non-Netshow server, for using. The selecting feature also includes sending scheduling information to the selected server to schedule the presentation broadcast. It is noted that non-Netshow server handles maximum 15 users to access the server for watching the presentation, while Netshow server handles more than 15 users. The system provides a web page that contains a URL at which the presentation broadcast will be viewed. (see col. 14, lines 43-47; col. 14, line 65 to col. 15, line 1; Figure 5 and col. 15, lines 17-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hidary by providing scheduling information to server, i.e., netshow server, before broadcast video program and URL as taught by Parasnis in order to enable the server to efficiently handling the expected load.

Regarding claim 3, Hidary discloses sending scheduling information, e.g., link file, with video. It is noted that the records in the link file specify the time, URL, label, and some additional information, for each web page the broadcaster desires to launch during a show (see abstract; col. 6, lines 14-25).

Regarding claim 4, Hidary discloses transmitting the video with embedded URLs over a transport, e.g., satellite, cable, television broadcast, or Internet; and transmitting scheduling information over Internet (see col. 5, lines 1-5; col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 12).

Regarding claim 5, Hidary discloses pre-scheduling URLs for transmitting to the user at a different time than the video transmitting (see col. 5, lines 58-65; col. 6, lines 26-31).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Hidary discloses transmitting scheduling information over Internet transport and transmitting video over broadcast transport (see col. 5, lines 1-6 and 58-62).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claim 8, Hidary discloses that the uniform resource locators are encoded into the video for transmitting (see col. 4, line 40 to col. 5, line 5 and lines 34-37).

Regarding claim 9, Hidary discloses automatically transmitting the scheduling information to web site hosting facility (90) after pre-scheduling URLs by broadcaster (see col. 5, lines 55-62).

Regarding claim 10, Hidary discloses transmitting scheduling information to the web site hosting facility (90) via database (78), or directly from Internet web site (62) (see figure 4; col. 5, lines 50-65; col. 6, lines 26-41).

Regarding claim 11, Hidary discloses an article comprising a medium storing instructions (software) that cause a processor-based system (e.g., computer) to send scheduling information via user interface to server 90 for pre-scheduling URL for transmission to users 118 at particular times of day before broadcast video information - see col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 14; col. 6, lines 32-41); and transmitting the video information in the form of television programming (e.g., television show – see col. 6, lines 3-12 and figure 4).

Hidary does not teach sending the scheduling information to server before distributing video program and URL to user to enable the server to prepare for an increase access load. However, Parasnis teaches sending scheduling information to Netshow server to handle expected load when the broadcaster desires to broadcast presentation. Particularly, the broadcaster selects which server, e.g., Netshow or non-Netshow server, for using. The selecting feature also includes sending scheduling information to the selected server to schedule the presentation broadcast. It is noted that non-Netshow server handles maximum 15 users to access the server for watching the presentation, while Netshow server handles more than 15 users. The system provides a web page that contains a URL at which the presentation

Art Unit: 2611

broadcast will be viewed. (see col. 14, lines 43-47; col. 14, line 65 to col. 15, line 1; Figure 5 and col. 15, lines 17-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hidary by providing scheduling information to server, i.e., netshow server, before broadcast video program and URL as taught by Parasnis in order to enable the server to efficiently handling the expected load.

Regarding claim **14**, Hidary discloses transmitting the video with embedded URLs over a transport, e.g., satellite, cable, television broadcast, or Internet; and transmitting scheduling information over Internet (see col. 5, lines 1-5; col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 12).

Regarding claim **15**, Hidary discloses pre-scheduling URLs for transmitting to the user at a different time than the video transmitting (see col. 5, lines 58-65; col. 6, lines 26-31).

Regarding claims **16** and **17**, Hidary discloses transmitting scheduling information over Internet transport and transmitting video over broadcast transport (see col. 5, lines 1-6 and 58-62).

Regarding claim **18**, Hidary discloses that the uniform resource locators are encoded into the video for transmitting (see col. 4, line 40 to col. 5, line 5 and lines 34-37).

Regarding claim **19**, Hidary discloses automatically transmitting the scheduling information to web site hosting facility (90) after pre-scheduling URLs by broadcaster (see col. 5, lines 55-62).

Regarding claim **20**, Hidary discloses transmitting scheduling information to the web site hosting facility (90) via database (78), or directly from Internet web site (62) (see figure 4; col. 5, lines 50-65; col. 6, lines 26-41).

Regarding claim **21**, Hidary discloses a system (see figure 4) comprising: a video distribution device 66, 110; a transport 86 coupled to the video distribution device that

Art Unit: 2611

distributes video to a plurality of receivers 114 and 16; and storage 70 coupled to the device 110, the storage storing instructions (software) that enable the device to send scheduling information via user interface to server 90 for pre-scheduling URL for transmission to users at particular times of day before broadcast video information - see col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 14; col. 6, lines 32-41); and transmitting the video information in the form of television programming (e.g., television show – see col. 6, lines 3-12 and figure 4).

Hidary does not teach sending the scheduling information to server in advance of distributing video program and URL to users to enable the server to prepare for an increase access load. However, Parasnis teaches sending scheduling information to Netshow server to handle expected load when the broadcaster desires to broadcast presentation. Particularly, the broadcaster selects which server, e.g., Netshow or non-Netshow server, for using. The selecting feature also includes sending scheduling information to the selected server to schedule the presentation broadcast. It is noted that non-Netshow server handles maximum 15 users to access the server for watching the presentation, while Netshow server handles more than 15 users. The system provides a web page that contains a URL at which the presentation broadcast will be viewed. (see col. 14, lines 43-47; col. 14, line 65 to col. 15, line 1; Figure 5 and col. 15, lines 17-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hidary by providing scheduling information to server, i.e., netshow server, before broadcast video program and URL as taught by Parasnis in order to enable the server to efficiently handling the expected load.



Regarding **claim 22**, Hidary teaches that the distribution device (66, 110) coupled to the web hosting facility (90) through the Internet (20, 62) and instructions (software) stores in the storage (70) cause the device to automatically notify the web site hosting facility (90) over the Internet before distributing a URL and video to the users (see Hidary: see figure 4; col. 5, lines 50-65; col. 6, lines 26-41). Furthermore, Prasanis teaches notifying the third-party provider over the Internet prior a web page including video and a URL is distributed to the viewers (Parasanis: col. 16, lines 6-28; col. 16-17, lines 63-2; col. 17, lines 10-17; col. 17-18, lines 49-3; col. 27-30; col. 20, lines 23-49, figure 8).

Regarding **claim 23**, Hidary discloses two transports (e.g., Internet 20 and broadcast 86) coupled between the video distribution device (66, 110) and the web site hosting facility (90) (see figure 4).

Regarding **claim 24**, Hidary teaches that the instructions (software) stores in the storage (70) cause the video distribution device (66, 110) to automatically notify the web hosting facility (90) via database (78), or directly from Internet web site (62) when a URL will be transmitted with the video distributed to the receivers (118) (see figure 4; col. 5, lines 50-65; col. 6, lines 26-41).

Regarding **claim 25**, Hidary discloses video distribution device broadcasts video for distribution to the plurality of receives (see col. 5, lines 1-5).

Regarding **claim 26**, Hidary discloses that the uniform resource locators are encoded into the video for transmitting (see col. 4, line 40 to col. 5, line 5 and lines 34-37).

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc K. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-7306. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ngoc K. Vu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2611

June 13, 2005